UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,853	01/26/2006	Yukitaka Shimizu	19070230PUS1	8106
	7590 05/03/201 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH MA 22040 0747	MUHAMMAD, KHALIF R		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3685		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/03/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/565,853	SHIMIZU ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	KHALIF MUHAMMAD	3685	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 January 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount thortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	36(a) and the appropria of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	te extension fee late extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS 7. The proposed emendment(s) filed after a final rejection.	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b	0001100
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further contains 	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		TE Below),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) \square They present additional claims without canceling a $lpha$	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	, , , ,		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Calvin L Hewitt II/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment will not be entered because Claims 34 and 35 recite...a computer readable non-transitory recording medium... however since Claims 34 and 35 are directed to computer readable non-transitory storage medium it is not patent elgible subject matter. computer readable medium is defined according to the "Microsoft Press Dictionary Defintion" or "IEEE Defintion". According to MPEP 2106 II IV, however, there are four categories of invention: process, machine, article of manufacture or composition of matter. Therefore, as "computer readale medium" is neither a category of invention nor a subset of one of the categories it does not represent patent eligible subject matter (In re Nuitjen, Docket no. 2006-1371 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 20, 2007)(slip. op. at 18)).

Previously presented Claim 14 has limitations such as ...a content reproduction device... to read...to transmit....to receive and store...a license server....to receive...to transmit...to compare...subtracts...However, Ishiguro discloses all of the structural elements in the claim; license server (figs 9,11 and 33; col 12 lines 1-25; col 7 lines 40-65), content reproduction device (figs 6 44; col 20 lines 1-30; col 28 lines 35-55) and license vending machine (fig 9;col 6 lines 60-65;col 12 lines 1-25). The functional language does not have patentable weight as the language merely recites the function of the license server, content reproduction device, and license vending machine. Ishiguro is sufficient in terms of art as it teaches the Applicant's claimed structure